

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 04104 271908Z

55

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-07 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 SS-20

USIA-15 AEC-11 OIC-04 OMB-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 TRSE-00

DRC-01 /133 W

----- 056929

R 271659Z JUN 74

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 6734

INFO ALL CSCE CAPITALS 161

AMEMBASSY OSLO

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLO SACLANT NORFOLK VA

USDOCOSOUTH

CINCLANT

C O N F I D E N T I A L GENEVA 4104

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, PARM

SUBJ: CSCE: CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES (CBMS)

1. SUMMARY: SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY SECURITY ON JUNE 26
BEGAN SECOND ROUND OF DISCUSSIONS ON PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF
MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS. AUSTRIA, SPEAKING FOR THE
NEUTRALS, ARGUED FORCEFULLY THAT PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVE-
MENTS WAS ESSENTIAL TO CONFIDENCE BUILDING. SOVIETS ARGUED
THAT UNTIL THERE WAS AGREEMENT ON HOW THE SUBCOMMITTEE WOULD
DISPOSE OF THE MOVEMENTS QUESTION AS A WHOLE THERE WAS NO
PURPOSE IN DISCUSSING THE DETAILS. CZECHS ADDED A FURTHER
SENTENCE TO ORIGINAL SOVIET PROPOSAL WHICH SPECIALLY TIED
MOVEMENTS TO "FOLLOW-UP". SOVIET REP OUTSIDE MEETING ASKED
US DEL TO CLARIFY USG ATTITUDE TOWARDS MOVEMENTS QUESTION.
END SUMMARY.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 04104 271908Z

2. USING CSCE/II/C/110 AS A BASIS FOR DISCUSSION, SUBCOMMITTEE

BEGAN EFFORT TO REDRAFT DOCUMENT. NO NEW TEXTS WERE REGISTERED AND US REP DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN DEBATE. SUBCOMMITTEE DID AGREE INFORMALLY TO ACCEPTING FIRST SENTENCE OF THE DOCUMENT WHICH NOW READS, "IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HELSINKI CONSULTATIONS THE PARTICIPATING STATES STUDIED THE QUESTION OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS". EFFORTS TO DRAFT FURTHER FAILED BECAUSE OF SOVIET INSISTENCE THAT THERE HAD TO BE A GENERAL AGREEMENT ON THE DISPOSITION OF THE MOVEMENTS QUESTION BEFORE DETAILED DRAFTING COULD PROCEED.

3. AUSTRALIAN DELEGATION MADE SEVERAL INTERVENTIONS AND ARGUED STRONGLY FOR MOVEMENTS AS ONE OF THE MOST ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS FOR CONFIDENCE BUILDING. HE DREW SUPPORT FROM YUGOSLAVIA, U.S., FRG, BELGIUM, CANADA, NETHERLANDS, FRANCE, IRELAND. MAIN THRUST OF WARSAW PACT COUNTER WAS THAT TIME WAS NOT RIPE FOR MOVEMENTS CBMS. IN THE PROCESS CZECHS PROPOSED AN ADDITIONAL SENTENCE TO ORIGINAL SOVIET TEXT WHICH TIES MOVEMENTS TO "FOLLOW-UP". NEW CZECH SENTENCE READS AS FOLLOWS: "THIS CONSIDERATION MAY BE RESUMED IF IT IS CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE FOLLOW-UP OF THE CONFERENCE". BLOC COUNTRIES SUPPORTED THIS NEW IDEA AND YUGOSLAVIA FOUND IT ESPECIALLY ATTRACTIVE IN CASE AGREEMENT COULD NOT BE REACHED NOW ON A MOVEMENTS CBM. YUGOSLAV DEL TOOK LINE THAT IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO DEVELOP NEW MOVEMENTS PARAMETERS WHICH COULD POSSIBLY BE APPLIED LATER UNDER SOME FORM OF "FOLLOW-UP". MECHANISM. IRELAND WAS OF A SIMILAR VIEW. ONLY FRANCE SPOKE AGAINST THE "FOLLOW-UP". CONCEPT. DEBATE WENT BACK AND FORTH BETWEEN AUSTRIAN AND THE SOVIET DELEGATE AND NO AGREEMENT WAS REACHED ON WHETHER OR NOT TO CONTINUE A DISCUSSION OF THE PARAMETERS. SOVIET DEL STASHEVSKI EXPRESSED HIS DESIRE TO DEFER FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THE SUBJECT UNTIL LATER IN THE CONFERENCE.

4. IN THE CORRIDOR AFTER THE MEETING STASHEVSKI APPROACHED US REP AND ASKED WHY US DELEGATION HAD REMAINED SILENT SINCE USG OPPOSED MOVEMENTS CBM. HE ASKED FURTHER IF US REP EXPECTED SOVIET DELEGATION TO DO HIS DIRTY WORK. US REP REPLIED THAT HIS DELEGATION DID NOT SPEAK OFTEN ON MANY POINTS AND THAT SOVIETS SHOULD NOT DRAW ANY CONCLUSIONS FROM SUCH SILENCE AS AN EXPRESSION OF ATTITUDE FOR OR AGAINST ANY PARTICULAR POINT. CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 04104 271908Z

STASHEVSKI THEN ASKED WHAT US POSITION WAS ON MOVEMENTS. US REP SAID THAT THERE WERE A NUMBER OF PROPOSALS UNDER CONSIDERATION INCLUDING THE UK, SOVIET AND NORWEGIAN AND THAT THERE WERE BOUND TO BE MORE. USG WOULD CONSIDER ALL OF THEM AND WAS LISTENING ATTENTIVELY TO THE DISCUSSION WHICH WOULD BE FAITHFULLY REPORTED TO WASHINGTON. US REP SAID THERE WAS A COMMON NATO POSITION ON MOVEMENTS AND THAT THE US WAS A MEMBER OF NATO. USG SUPPORTED THE NATO POSITIONS

ON ALL CBMS BUT HAD AN OPEN MIND ON ALL POSITIONS. STASHEVSKI SAID HE HAD MISUNDERSTOOD THE US POSITION AND PERHAPS THIS WOULD BE CLARIFIED BETWEEN HEADS OF STATE. US REP SAID HE HAD NO INFORMATION THAT SUBJECT WOULD COME UP, BUT IF IT DID SUCH DISCUSSION WOULD NATURALLY BE A NEW FACTOR. U.S. REP CONCLUDED BY SAYING US DEL COULD NOT ACCEPT CZECH PROPOSAL ON "FOLLOW-UP" AND STASHEVSKI SAID THAT COULD BE DROPPED.

5. SEVEAL NATO DELEGATES OBSERVED THIS EXCHANGE AND SOUTH OUT US REP IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING. FRG, FRANCE, BELGIUM, CANADA DN ITALY ASKED FOR ASSURANCE THAT THE US HAD NOT BROKEN RANKS. US REP GAVE THEM FULL ACCOUNT OF THE CONVERSATION WITH STASHEVSKI. NATO REPS ASKED IF US REP OBJECTED TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE DISCUSSION ON MOVEMENTS PARAMETERS. US REP SAID HE HAD NO OBJECTION.

6. COMMENT: IT IS OF COURSE TOO EARLY TO PREDICT HOW MOVEMENTS ISSUE WILL BE RESOLVED. SOVIET POSITION ON MOVEMENTS HAS NOT SOFTENED AND NEUTRALS ARE EQUALLY DETERMINED IN THEIR POSITION FROM THE FAVOR OF THIS CBM. NATO WANTS TO EXTRACT A HEAVY PRICE FROM THE SOVIETS IN RETURN FOR DROPPING ISSUE. MEANWHILE, POSITION OF US DEL ON THIS QUESTION IS EXTREMELY AWKWARD. ABRAMS

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: SECURITY, REPORTS, MILITARY PLANS, COMMITTEE MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 27 JUN 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: BoyleJA
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974GENEVA04104
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D740171-0125
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t1974069/aaaaahjt.tel
Line Count: 139
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: BoyleJA
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 28 MAY 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <28 MAY 2002 by shawdg>; APPROVED <24 MAR 2003 by BoyleJA>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE: CONFIDENCE-BUILDING MEASURES (CBMS)
TAGS: PFOR, PARM, CSCE
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005